



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,782	03/14/2002	Ji Ming Wang	NIH173.001C1	4832

20995 7590 02/25/2004

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

TURNER, SHARON L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/099,782	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Sharon L. Turner	Art Unit 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>11-04-02</u> | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>IDS 11-12-03</u> |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The brief description of the drawings should be amended to reflect the proper views, in particular Figure 1A-1C, 2A-2F and 4A-4D. Appropriate correction is required.

Election/Restriction

2. Applicant's election of Group XXXIV, claim 23 in part drawn to a method of making a pharmaceutical product comprising a peptide having a sequence corresponding to SAA, in the paper of 12-08-03 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 1-22 and 24-28 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the paper of 12-08-03.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The new title should reflect the elected invention.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 23 is objected to as being directed to non-elected subject matter. M.P.E.P. 803.02 states that:

"Since the decisions in *In re Weber* **, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978); and *In re*

Haas, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention, In re Harnish , 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); Ex Parte Hozumi , 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.”

In instant case the claims remain drawn to “providing a peptide agent having a sequence corresponding to FPRL1”, which subject matter is non-elected.

5. Claim 23 is objected to for the use of the abbreviation FPRL1 without it's first use distinguishing the parent molecule's full word designation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial, credible asserted utility or a well established utility.

The specification discloses a screening method utilizing serum amyloid A (SAA) and the FPRL1 receptor which interaction is disclosed as mediating, for example, chemotaxis in particular immune cells. However, the method steps identify the peptides tested regardless of outcome in the “identifying” steps ie, whether or not there is a presence or absence of signal transduction. Moreover, the method incorporates the

Art Unit: 1647

peptide to the pharmaceutical regardless of particular outcome or function, and thus the utility of the invention is not linked in any way to a specific or substantial function of SAA/FPRL1 interaction, for example in chemotaxis. Thus, the identifying step fails to result in the formation of a pharmaceutical for any recognizable use, purpose or outcome. The screening assay fails to provide compositions with properties that would be reasonably associated with or expected to be associated with any particular use, function or pharmaceutical effect because the selection is not so linked. Further, the claim is directed to signal transduction. Yet the artisan fails to recognize a particular use associated with merely providing for signal transduction within a cell. Signal transduction is a broadly directed term referring to the activity of any biochemical pathway within the cell, regardless of the functional outcome to the cell. The specification fails to distinguish how signal transduction in general is effective to provide for any specific, substantial or well established outcome that would merit screening for a pharmaceutical or any particularly beneficial use. Screening is useful when the claim results in the selection of a compound for which utility is established or reasonably expected. Yet in instant case no correlation is provided, the compound is selected regardless of effect, and a pharmaceutically functional outcome is not disclosed. For these reasons there does not appear to be either a specific and substantial, asserted utility or well-established utility for the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact

Art Unit: 1647

terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial, credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

In addition to the aforementioned, the following defects are noted with respect to enablement of instant invention as claimed.

10. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

The specification describes the testing steps of providing a peptide agent having a sequence corresponding to serum amyloid A (SAA) "or conservative variants or functional fragments thereof." with a cell having FPRL1 that interacts with the peptide agent and contacting to allow interaction and signal transduction. Such "interactions" and "transductions" are the presumed mechanisms of screening intended by Applicant's. While the specification describes SAA and modified SAA proteins, the specification fails to teach the structural characteristics of SAA conservative variants or functional fragments thereof that allow for the functional interaction and transduction as claimed. However, the claims as written encompass such polypeptides that vary

Art Unit: 1647

substantially in length and also in amino acid composition. In addition, the recitation of signal transduction encompasses a multitude of activities that are not adequately described. The instant disclosure of the interaction of the SAA molecule with FPRL1 to provide for chemotaxis and calcium mobilization, for example, does not adequately support the scope of the claimed genus, which encompasses a substantial variety of subgenera. A genus claim may be supported by a representative number of species as set forth in *Regents of the University of California v Eli Lilly & Co*, 119F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997), which states:

“To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that “the inventor invented the claimed invention”. Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1980) (“[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed.”) Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement “by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious,” and by using “such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention.” Lockwood, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, “requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties,” not a mere wish or plan

Art Unit: 1647

for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. Fiers v. Revel, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." Id at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606."

A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNAs, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus, or of a recitation of structural features common to the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. The instant specification discloses, however, two distinct molecules which bind to promote calcium mobilization and chemotaxis in particular cells.

Receptor function, however, cannot be reliably predicted from protein sequence homology. For example, Transforming Growth Factor (TGF-beta) Family OP-1 induces metanephrogenesis whereas closely related TGF-beta family members-BMP-2 and TGF-beta1-have no effect on metanephrogenesis under identical conditions (Vukicevic et al., 1996, PNAS USA 93:9021-9026). Platelet-derived Growth Factor (PDGF) Family VEGF, a member of the PDGF family, is mitogenic for vascular endothelial cells but not for vascular smooth muscle cells while PDGF is mitogenic for vascular smooth muscle cells but not for vascular endothelial cells (Tischer et al., U.S. Patent 5,194,596, column 2, line 46 to column 3, line 2). Finally, vertebrate growth hormone of 198 amino acids becomes an antagonist (inhibitor of growth) when a single amino acid is changed (Kopchick et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,350,836). Even 99% homology does not allow

predictability in this instance. Given the unpredictability of homology comparisons, and the fact that the specification fails to provide objective evidence of variant sequences that are indeed species of the claimed genus it cannot be established that a representative number of species have been disclosed to support the genus claim. No specific structure or activity is required. Thus, the claimed invention lacks adequate written description support.

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specifications disclosure is insufficient to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention as broadly claimed without undue experimentation. The factors relevant to this discussion include the quantity of experimentation necessary, the lack of working examples, the unpredictability of the art, the lack of sufficient guidance in the specification and the breadth of the claims.

Applicants claims are directed to "A method of making a pharmaceutical product comprising" However, the method steps do not "make" any product but merely "incorporate (any) peptide into (a) pharmaceutical product". The method steps do not make the peptides, the peptides are selected based merely upon their inclusion in the broad generic class of existing molecules. Thus the method is commensurate with one of "identifying" and not of "making".

Moreover, the method lacks incorporation to the pharmaceutical based on any

particular outcome, and thus the utility of the invention is not linked in any way to an identifiable effect. While a biologically relevant function of SAA/FPRL1 interaction includes chemotaxis, the claim is directed to an identifying step that is not linked to a particular result and thus fails to result in the formation of a pharmaceutical for any recognizable purpose or outcome. The compounds are selected regardless of the presence or absence of signal transduction.

Further, the claim is directed to signal transduction. Yet the artisan fails to recognize a particular use associated with merely providing for signal transduction within a cell. Signal transduction is a broadly directed term referring to the activity of any biochemical pathway within the cell, regardless of the functional outcome to the cell. The specification fails to distinguish how signal transduction in general and regardless of increase or decrease is effective as a pharmaceutical for beneficial use to patients suffering from any specific condition.

Similarly, the specification does not enable the broad scope of the claims that encompasses a multitude of analogs or equivalents because the specification does not teach which residues can or should be modified such that requisite functionality is maintained, note utility rejection above. The specification provides essentially no guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful in any particular use and the skilled artisan would not expect functional conservation amongst homologous sequences. Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed derivatives in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims.

The skilled artisan recognizes that nucleic and amino acid alterations may lead to differences in function. For example, the skilled artisan recognizes as noted in Skolnick et al., Trends in Biotech 18(1):34-39, 2000 and as further exemplified by Choh, PNAS 77(6):3211-14, 1990, that one or more amino acid deletions, insertions or substitutions including truncations results in unpredictable effects in the resulting biological molecule, its' biological function, the ability to bind and/or exhibit similar immunoreactivity. The specification teaches no structural or functional activities relevant to the screening method and fails to teach any residues which may be exchanged while retaining requisite activity or function

The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (In re Fisher, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without such guidance, the changes which can be made and still maintain activity/utility is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1986). Thus, the skilled artisan cannot readily make and use the claimed sequences without further undue experimentation.

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

14. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

Art Unit: 1647

incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are those steps that "make" a pharmaceutical product.

15. Claim is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: those elements to which the peptide is to be added to "make" the pharmaceutical product. The incorporation of the peptide is to no identified composition, in particular no elements of the product composition other than the peptide are specified.

Status of Claims

16. No claims are allowed.

17. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this general application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600, Group 1640 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Should applicant wish to FAX a response, the current FAX number for Group 1600 is ~~(703) 308-4242~~ ~~571~~ *272-0894*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon L. Turner, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached at (703) 308-4623.



Sharon L. Turner, Ph.D.
February 20, 2004